

BEFORE THE
CALIFORNIA STATE AUDITOR
BUREAU OF STATE AUDITS

In the matter of

Citizens Redistricting Commission (CRC)
Applicant Review Panel (ARP)

555 Capitol Mall, 5th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 2010
9:30 A.M.

Reported by:
Peter Petty

APPEARANCES

Members Present

Nasir Ahmadi, Chair
Mary Camacho, Vice Chair
Kerri Spano, Panel Member

Staff Present

Stephanie Ramirez-Ridgeway, Counsel
Diane Hamel, Executive Secretary

I N D E X

	Page
Proceedings	4
Opening Remarks	
Nasir Ahmadi, Chair	4
ITEM 5. Public Comment on Applicants	4
ITEM 6. Discussion relating to panelists' initial assessments about applicants, further assessment and review of all remaining applicants, requests for additional information from remaining applicants, and remaining applicant selection phases	5
ITEM 7. Public Comment	28
Adjournment	28
Certificate of Reporter	29

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

P R O C E E D I N G S

SEPTEMBER 13, 2010 9:30 A.M.

MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: The hour being 9:30 and all the Panelists being present, we can go back on record. We held open Item 5 on the agenda, Applicant Interviews, for the purpose of taking public comment this morning, and as we can see by our crowd, we don't have any. And so, with that, I would propose that we could stand at ease for five minutes to see if we have any stragglers who would like to comment on Item 5, and if we don't get anyone by 9:35, then we should move on.

CHAIR AHMADI: Sounds good.
VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: I agree with you.

MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: All right, so let's stand at ease.

(Off the record at 9:31 a.m.)
(Back on the record at 9:35 a.m.)

MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: It's 9:35 and we have not received any stragglers. I want to note for the record that we do have a period of public comment that I believe ends this Friday, so if there are individuals who could not make it today, who would like to submit written comment regarding Applicants, they may do so through the Bureau's website and we are interested, of course, in knowing not just what your thoughts were with regard to particular Applicants, but also

1 why. So, we are hoping that we hear from some people.

2 **ITEM 6. Discussion relating to requests for additional**
3 **information from or about remaining applicants, remaining**
4 **applicant selection phases and process, and schedule.**

5 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: So Item 5, being concluded,
6 we can move forward to Item 6, which is a discussion related
7 to requests for additional information from or about
8 remaining applicants, the remaining applicant selection
9 phases, and the process and schedule. So, Mr. Ahmadi, would
10 you like to begin?

11 CHAIR AHMADI: Sure, thank you so much. Before I
12 start, we start in to discuss Item 6, I just wanted to
13 personally thank all of our Applicants who have taken time
14 off from their busy lives, coming here and meet with us, and
15 speak to us, that's really, you know, it's something that I
16 really appreciate and I just want to make sure that they
17 understand that, you know, they made it very difficult of us
18 to move forward because, in each one of them, I personally
19 saw certain values that will challenge me to make my final
20 decision. So, thank you so much for all your informative
21 and educational information that you shared with us.

22 So Item 6 is a discussion about where we go next, or
23 how we approach. I have given it some thoughts all along,
24 of course, and knowing that this next step is going to be
25 perhaps the most challenging step in the process of the

1 selection, in other words, reducing the applicant pool to 60
2 of the most qualified applicants, I think the best approach
3 for me would be to balance the qualifications,
4 personalities, attitudes, availability, commitment, take all
5 of that into consideration to see what might be the best
6 complement for the Commission as a whole.

7 As I stated several times, you know, individually
8 they all have something to share and there's no doubt that
9 that makes it difficult, and I know I am repeating this
10 several times now, but that's the truth.

11 So, what I will be looking for, just to start the
12 discussion, you know, these are not in terms of priority or
13 anything, it's just about what comes to my mind based on my
14 notes that I have here, the first thing would be the
15 personalities; in other words, I'm looking for those
16 qualities and personalities that will allow true and
17 effective team work for the Commission, individuals who have
18 shared with us their achievements in life, no doubt, you
19 know, I'm really impressed with that; but, at the same time,
20 I would be thinking hard about my judgment in terms of would
21 they be challenged when they are put on the spot to work
22 with the other 13 Commissioners, to discuss the issues and
23 make decisions, for the good of the residents, as a whole of
24 California.

25 So, commitment and availability is another factor

1 that I will consider. Nobody has done this work before, and
2 we cannot say for sure how much time it takes, but one thing
3 that I do, based on my limited experience, you know, being
4 exposed to the information, and all the requirements, and
5 based on my understanding of what it takes, I think it is
6 safe to say that it's going to be a major undertaking, it's
7 going to be - there is going to be tremendous demand on
8 their time to be available, to have the commitment to give
9 it their best in terms of, you know, traveling, or meeting
10 late hours, or putting in extra hours regardless of week
11 days or weekends. So, I would be looking for those
12 qualities, as well, to make sure that they're not challenged
13 again, and therefore there is no - how shall I say this -
14 it's difficult to say, for example, when I say "they're not
15 challenged," because they all have shared with us their
16 commitment, they all have told us that they will do their
17 best to do it, but with certain individuals, I think we have
18 asked questions about their commitments with their current
19 job, or current responsibilities, and when I asked questions
20 about how much time they will be willing to put into the
21 Commission's work, where the responses were maybe on a
22 weekend or after hours, or maybe working through the e-mail,
23 I would give it some close kind of attention to see whether
24 or not, because of their current responsibilities and
25 commitments and involvement with their current jobs and

1 personal commitments, that they're not challenged by the
2 Commission's work.

3 I know I have asked - and please feel free to jump
4 in, and I am going to - some of the topics here - but we can
5 come back and talk about each one of them again because I am
6 interested to also hear from you guys, so -

7 PANEL MEMBER SPANO: I'm glad to say I'm totally
8 agreeing with you --

9 CHAIR AHMADI: Okay, thank you so much.

10 PANEL MEMBER SPANO: -- as you talk.

11 VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: Now, with the commitment and
12 availability that you're talking about, are you saying that,
13 if a person has a full time job, that you're not even going
14 to consider them?

15 CHAIR AHMADI: No, that's not what I meant.

16 VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: Can you clarify that for me a
17 little bit more?

18 CHAIR AHMADI: Sure. There is no doubt that, as I
19 mentioned, the Commission work will be demanding in terms of
20 the amount of time that the Commissioners have to put in. I
21 will look into their responses when they responded to our
22 questions about their availability. I will look into to
23 their understanding of - what is their understanding of the
24 amount of work that the Commission takes, which is kind of
25 like, in a way, it's their understanding of how much will it

1 take for the Commission to be successful. People may have,
2 I don't know, I don't have names to discuss here, and I
3 don't want to, kind of because at this point, I have to go
4 back to the interviews, go back to my notes, go back to my
5 questions and their answers, but in general terms, if they
6 have no knowledge or understanding of the tremendous amount
7 of time that the Commission will take to be successful, my
8 interpretation of how that response will be that they may be
9 challenged if they are one of 14 Commissioners.

10 PANEL MEMBER SPANO: Challenged meaning
11 responsibilities.

12 CHAIR AHMADI: Yeah.

13 PANEL MEMBER SPANO: I tend to agree with him that
14 there are those that may be able to manage a full time job
15 and still be committed to the CRC's responsibilities. When
16 I looked at the Applicants and their responses, together
17 with their interview and their application, you get a sense
18 of those that are truly - at least, I tried - truly
19 understand the demands of this work because the availability
20 and the time commitment has not been set forth yet, at least
21 the Commission's decision. So, based on what we've been
22 tasked to do in selecting the applicants, I realize that
23 their responsibility and charge is going to be quite
24 demanding, and more so. And I imagine it is going to be
25 extremely stressful on these candidates, also, so I look at

1 their experience based on their workloads existing today, or
2 in the past. But it's a matter of people that think of this
3 as a serious impact on the State of California and its
4 decisions for the future, and those that view this just as
5 community service, wanting to fill in their time. So, I'm
6 looking at those differences in the context of their
7 responses.

8 VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: Okay.

9 CHAIR AHMADI: So, in other words, when I see
10 commitment and availability, I hope I don't sound like I'm
11 saying that only those individuals who do not - who are
12 retired, for example, or who do not have any other jobs to
13 do because they all have a life, and they all have business
14 to do. And I believe, you know, I'm not an expert, but I
15 believe the law doesn't require them to have a full time
16 kind of attention to the Commission. The law says that they
17 should be able to do the job. So, that's what makes it more
18 difficult, because it is subject. As you said, Kerri, they
19 may have a job, but then they may also be able to put extra
20 hours to do the job, and that's fine with me. But you,
21 Mary, I'm now looking for a quantitative kind of like number
22 of hours, all right, it's just about my understanding of
23 whether or not they will be challenged in terms of their
24 availability, regardless of whether or not they have a full
25 time job. But if we - in some specific areas, we may be

1 able to use that as a factor in our decision, in a more
2 clear way, because some individuals, if you recall, did tell
3 us that they will be working only on the weekend, for
4 example. So, that is maybe an easier - not an easier, but
5 that may be a more clear factor in that decision-making
6 process vs. someone who is able from their description of
7 experiences in the past, and their style, and their
8 personality, and commitment, even though they have a job,
9 they can still be successful, so I'm looking for, you know,
10 I have to be comfortable with my decision, knowing that this
11 individual can do the job. That's where I want to go with
12 the commitment and the availability.

13 VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: So, these attributes, or these
14 skills that you're putting out right now are skills that
15 you'd like to see in all the applicants that you're
16 potentially going to move forward?

17 CHAIR AHMADI: Yes.

18 VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: Okay. And can we go back to
19 the personalities?

20 CHAIR AHMADI: Sure.

21 VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: When you're saying true and
22 effective team work, are you saying just that they can work
23 in a team environment, or that they're consensus driven,
24 also?

25 CHAIR AHMADI: Uh, both, actually. What I really

1 want to see in terms of, you know, team work, quality, or
2 personality, is that, regardless of what they achieved in
3 life, and their employment or personal life experiences,
4 they should understand that this is a new undertaking for
5 everybody, and there is no clear - we cannot judge about,
6 you know, how difficult, or easy, or challenging this could
7 be. So, individuals who come to the Commission with certain
8 expectations based on their own personal experience that
9 they can do the job, they may be a little more optimistic;
10 in other words, there is a certain value in being a little
11 on the cautious side of, you know, taking it serious and
12 knowing this is something that nobody has done before, and
13 just because I have achieved certain goals in my personal
14 life, or past experiences, doesn't mean that I will be
15 successful. There should be some - there is an unknown
16 factor in the work of the CRC.

17 VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: But wouldn't you want a person
18 that is flexible, they could be optimistic, but flexible -

19 CHAIR AHMADI: Sure.

20 VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: -- in their personality? Is
21 that what you're trying to get to, because from what I'm
22 hearing is, you are looking at a person that is more
23 pragmatic than optimistic? Is that what I'm hearing? Or
24 no?

25 CHAIR AHMADI: Well, let me see if I can say it this

1 way. Just because an individual has achieved, you know,
2 tremendous success in their past experience and life
3 experience doesn't mean that they can look at the
4 Commission's work with the same level of expectation; in
5 other words, they should check their ego at the door when
6 they come into the Commission. It's about, you know -

7 VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: It's someone that can work in a
8 team and take any task and be happy taking that task.

9 CHAIR AHMADI: Yeah, something - humility, you know,
10 being kind of like open to the fact that this is challenging
11 and, regardless of how successful you are in life, you may
12 not be successful here, you know? And I'll be looking for,
13 you know, those kind of qualities or trends in terms of, you
14 know, are they able to contribute to the team. And I think
15 the major contribution to the team would be to not have any
16 preconceptions or pre-notions about the Commission's work,
17 or how it should work, or you know, how it should be handled
18 in terms of, you know, the process.

19 VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: Now, if - because, as we were
20 listening to the applicants, there's individuals that gave
21 their opinion, but it doesn't mean that they're beholden to
22 that opinion.

23 CHAIR AHMADI: Correct -

24 VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: So I just kind of wanted to -
25 because you were talking about they had preconceived notions

1 and so I kind of wanted to clarify that a little bit.

2 CHAIR AHMADI: I think, for me, there's a difference
3 between having a preconceived notion about, you know, when
4 they responded to our questions and we asked those
5 questions, at least some of them, what would the first few
6 days will look like, or what would be the first few weeks,
7 or where do you start those kinds of questions. There is no
8 problem in my mind, you know, with individuals having ideas
9 about how it should be done. And I think there is value in
10 bringing all these different ideas together to see which one
11 - and it's up to the Commission to decide what is the - and
12 I'm sure that they are going to discuss and decide how to
13 approach this. What I meant by, you know, having
14 preconceptions is that certain responses, I don't remember
15 the names, I have to go back to the interviews and double-
16 check and triple-check, maybe, as time allows, certain
17 responses suggested to me that they - the individual does
18 not - thinks in a more simplistic kind of way, they think
19 that it's a very simple process, and it's not. So, there is
20 - I hope that answers your question, Mary. I'm not saying
21 that having -

22 VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: So, you're thinking that - I
23 just want to make sure that I understand - what I'm hearing
24 is that individuals that think this process is easier than
25 what most likely it will be, from what we've heard from some

1 of the experts out there, those are the ones that you're
2 talking about?

3 CHAIR AHMADI: I would consider that, yes. Again,
4 we have to look at the collective qualities and
5 personalities of each applicant to see in what way they will
6 contribute to the success of the work, and what are some of
7 the areas that they may be challenged. And when I say
8 "challenged," it doesn't mean that they're not able to do
9 the work because, in my judgment, you know, they're all able
10 to do the work. But, given the fact that we have - our goal
11 is to have a Commission that complements each other in terms
12 of qualities and ideas that they bring to the Commission,
13 but if I find an applicant, based on their responses, based
14 on their application material, based on their past
15 experiences, and employment history, and all that, that they
16 may be challenged in terms of, you know, their expectation
17 of what the Commission work should be like, or what the
18 Commission work will entail, then I'll consider that in my
19 decision. So, going back to -

20 VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: What - go ahead.

21 PANEL MEMBER SPANO: Go ahead. I'm listening to
22 both of you and hearing what you're saying, and I think I'm
23 agreeing with you on certain - I'm trying to get an
24 understanding, a better understanding of what you see in
25 these key qualities. You know, as I compare one against the

1 other, I need people that are going to stand out when we
2 narrow down to 60, and I want someone who is flexible not
3 only just saying, but demonstrating it throughout their
4 responses and in their application. I feel that, as we
5 spoke, as these applicants spoke to us, you can get a sense
6 at who is willing to be flexible and adaptable in this new
7 process, and working with new people for the first time, and
8 making critical decisions, and those who are not willing to
9 do that, even though they may say they are. I feel that
10 their biases may have shown through, while others said they
11 fully can set them aside, and have shown and demonstrated
12 that. I think it's a matter of determining whether these
13 people have the willingness to find commonality between
14 different individuals and groups to achieve equitable
15 results. You want applicants who aren't concerned about
16 running the show, but show willingness to lead, direct staff
17 as needed, shows a strong respect for people, whether it's a
18 fellow Commissioner, staff, or a member of the public. You
19 know, I was looking at individuals that have a strong desire
20 to focus on the understanding of the issues objectively,
21 that have a strong desire for fairness in a quality. You
22 know, I was looking at those that really couldn't show an
23 appreciation for the law in some way, shape, or form. I'm
24 not looking at someone who is an expert on the law, but
25 shows a willingness to follow it and adhere to it, and not

1 only that, but embraces the laws and transparency, without
2 any hidden agenda, who is on board with public disclosure
3 and Open Meeting Act, always aware of appropriate conduct
4 throughout the process, including any interactions with
5 Media. There are those that can just say it, and those that
6 can do it, and it's a matter of us to determine through
7 their responses that were provided to us whether they have
8 those skills and abilities to do so. You can see - I think
9 a Commissioner has to have strong passion for this job and
10 commitment, as well, and you can tell by their responses
11 when that showed through, some of them are very emotional
12 when they spoke about redistricting, while others really had
13 nothing better to do with their free time, I think. But you
14 can tell the people in their questions to us, or their
15 reactions to certain questions that we provide, and we asked
16 them some tough questions about their personalities and
17 about their experience, and a lot of them revealed a lot of
18 personal issues with us, and a lot of difficult decision-
19 making that they had to do in their life, whether it's in
20 their work or their personal life, so I feel like a lot of
21 that has shown us and given us insight on who these people
22 are and their character. And I think that will help us
23 filter through some of the qualities that we need in a
24 Commissioner. And I know you mentioned a good balance, and
25 I'm looking for a good balance because not all Commissioners

1 are going to be perfect in the analytical and statistical
2 analysis, but they better be impartial, and they better have
3 an appreciation for diversity, and geographic and
4 demographic, and all a respect for others.

5 CHAIR AHMADI: True, true. One thing that you
6 touched on, which I have as one of the items that I wanted
7 to go over, you know, we asked a lot of legal questions, I
8 asked a lot of legal questions of some of the applicants,
9 and my goal in asking those questions was not to test their
10 legal knowledge of the subject area because I am not
11 expecting them to be an expert in this, but more about, you
12 know, their thought process, their understanding of the fact
13 that they will be following the rules and regulations, you
14 know, both at the Federal and State level, and the
15 regulations that we have. So, I will look back at those
16 responses to see if the individual that I ask this legal
17 question was able to give me an answer that is reasonable,
18 in terms of, you know, thinking through the problem and
19 giving us a response that suggests that they are able to
20 understand the concept, it is more about the conceptual kind
21 of understanding of the issues, rather than the technical
22 aspects when it comes to the legal requirements, for
23 example. So, my goal was to get to know their thought
24 process on the legal issues.

25 PANEL MEMBER SPANO: And, Mary, if you want to chime

1 in, let me know. But, when it comes to diversity, I know a
2 lot of people struggled with this response as I saw them
3 speak to us, and in their application, and I am looking for
4 an individual, a Commissioner, who can appreciate diversity
5 beyond a surface or cursory approach, what diversity meant
6 to them in their life and experience and how it changed
7 them, beyond paraphrasing the Regulations.

8 VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: Let me just get this down. I
9 agree that they have to have the impartiality, diversity,
10 and the analytical skills that are stated. There are a few
11 things that I'm looking in, in the applicants. I want them,
12 like Nasir was saying, to be able to come to an agreement.
13 I don't want a stalemate, so I want them to be able to have
14 - they are consensus-oriented. I definitely, like Kerri was
15 saying, I want them to be flexible. And this is all of the
16 Applicants that I'm going to move forward because they're
17 going to have to be flexible.

18 CHAIR AHMADI: Flexible in what way? Can you be
19 specific?

20 VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: Willing to put aside their
21 process that they thought might be good, where they're able
22 to travel wherever is needed, that they understand that
23 things may have to change at a spur of the moment, that they
24 might have to adapt to different situations, so very
25 flexible, and not set in their ways. Does that kind of

1 clarify it a little bit better? I, like you were both
2 saying, I think the individuals, all that I move forward,
3 should have integrity, that the people of California know
4 that they are working for the best interest of California,
5 and that they don't have any hidden agenda there. Like you
6 both said, I think they should all have some motivation or
7 passion for this process, and so those are the qualities and
8 the personal aspect that I'd like to see in all of them that
9 I move forward. There are other ones, other qualities, that
10 I think should be there in certain people; I don't think all
11 of them should have to be able to facilitate, or be a great
12 leader, or wonderful at time management, because I think
13 that can be brought in with other individuals. I'd like to
14 - in communication, I'd like them to be able to all
15 communicate effectively by expressing themselves clearly and
16 concisely, and I think we can get that from the interviews
17 because they are going to be needing that when they have
18 their meetings or when they go out to the public, so I'd
19 like to see that in all of the applicants. I'd like to see
20 the applicants have a self-confidence, and that they are
21 there for the betterment of California and not hesitant.
22 Like Kerri said, that the understand that transparency is
23 very important. And those are the ones that I'd like to see
24 in all of them. There are other qualities that, you know,
25 for outreach and for math and the statistical that I can see

1 would be handy in other individuals - or, not in all the
2 individuals.

3 CHAIR AHMADI: I totally agree.

4 PANEL MEMBER SPANO: I am listening to you and I'm
5 checking it off as I look at this, and I understand the
6 importance of honesty and integrity in the process, and
7 conflict - not only in their words, but in their
8 interactions, also. And I know how important communities of
9 interest are to this process, it is an integral part of
10 getting information and making these critical decisions.
11 And I want a Commissioner who can listen to testimony
12 without prejudice or partiality, who makes an effort to
13 understand the needs and issues of the various groups of
14 people with different backgrounds and languages, and asks
15 questions if they don't understand, and really understands
16 the importance of public comment.

17 CHAIR AHMADI: I totally agree. So it sounds to me,
18 if I can kind of summarize for my own benefit of making sure
19 I understood, that there are like soft values in each one of
20 these applicants that may complement the collective
21 Commission. So, in terms of, you know, personalities,
22 commitments, availability, their thought process, their
23 understanding of the fact that this is the most important
24 undertaking -- historic undertaking -- which has to be -
25 they have to be committed to the success of the Commission's

1 work and you can talk more about the details, but as long
2 as, in our judgment they are committed and available and
3 helpful, and they have the type of personality that makes it
4 easier for them to work in a team environment, reach out to
5 the people, get input, and you know, seek for advice when
6 there is a need for it, or making sure that they understand
7 that they can identify the times when they need to seek
8 advice. In other words, being open to experts' opinion, for
9 example, without losing their position in terms of, you
10 know, they are the decision makers. They have to be able to
11 test the information in terms of, you know, is it fact or
12 opinion? Is it true or false kind of approach, maybe, even
13 with the public testimony, I think, you know, there is
14 certain value in having and approaching input with kind of a
15 skeptical an approach, to make sure that they are not buying
16 into anything that they hear, or anything that they receive
17 in terms of information, but the ability to understand what
18 is the impact of certain data or information.

19 I think we covered everything that I have on my list
20 in terms of those qualities.

21 VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: To link my qualities with yours
22 Kerri, is asking questions if they do not understand, that
23 is my self-confidence, they're not afraid to say, "I'm
24 wrong," or, you know, "I don't know." So, they may not be a
25 big talker, but they have the self-confidence to interact.

1 PANEL MEMBER SPANO: I figure - I look at us and
2 we're pretty much all different in how we communicate and
3 how we interact and make our decisions, and how we speak
4 today. I mean, I tend to listen more, and then, chime in,
5 but I believe this is such a collaborative process where
6 everybody has to keep an open mind, and critically listen to
7 each other and distinguish relevant facts from the relevant
8 issues, and not have a hidden agenda like you said. It's a
9 strong commitment in working with a diverse group of
10 different backgrounds, and being able to have that
11 cohesiveness and willingness to get there sooner than later,
12 and set aside, like you said, their egos, and bond, in order
13 to make the decision-making effective. And that means
14 asking the questions, asking counsel for appropriate advice,
15 but being willing and knowing the importance of their
16 responsibility in ultimately making the decision themselves.
17 And understanding the role of staff vs. their role in this
18 work, I think it is different and how to utilize experts,
19 also, I think is very important because a Commissioner
20 should not just rely on experts' opinions unless they really
21 question it and get an understanding of that, and that comes
22 through with their passion to learn about this and get it
23 right.

24 VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: One thing I did want to say is
25 we saw a lot, we've looked at their applications, we've

1 heard them answer our questions, and from that information,
2 as good as it is, this is what we're using to this, to gauge
3 their ability to do these qualities. So, if there is any
4 information that individuals out there could provide us on
5 anything that would help us with this decision, please do
6 provide public comment.

7 CHAIR AHMADI: Uh huh, definitely. One other thing
8 that I wanted to share with you is, when I look at my sub
9 pools of Democrats vs. Republicans vs. Other, my goal will
10 be to have a sub pool that achieves or meets all of these,
11 you know, qualities, and the goal that we have to make sure
12 that we have a good mix of these individuals who complement
13 each other, within each sub pool. But there may be times
14 where we may have to look at the - well, not maybe, but we
15 have to also look at the micro level, kind of like the 60 of
16 the most qualified individuals as a whole, should -

17 PANEL MEMBER SPANO: Reasonably represent
18 California?

19 CHAIR AHMADI: Yes, have all these qualities, so
20 there may be times that we have, for example, I'm just using
21 an example, an individual who is very good in bringing
22 facilitation of the meetings, for example, and as long as I
23 have one individual within - at least one, I should say -
24 within the 60 of the most qualified, I think, you know, that
25 would be something that we should look for.

1 VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: What I'm looking at with the
2 sub pools by political party is, I'm looking for, at least
3 from your example, at least one individual that can
4 facilitate within those sub pools, so the political parties,
5 so I'm not looking at just the 60, I'm looking at that 20.
6 I'd like to have one facilitator within that pool and one
7 facilitator within the Democrat, the Republican, and the
8 Other pool.

9 PANEL MEMBER SPANO: I'd actually like to see more
10 than one of that, that attribute, only because, you know,
11 the 20, I believe, will need to be interchangeable, so that
12 we are left with a solid pool of diverse candidates, after
13 the Legislature makes its strikes, so I think it's important
14 that we ensure that the qualities we discuss today, and in
15 addition to what is required of us, of the law, is
16 maintained in our decisions, in our choices, because I would
17 hate for any eliminations and to have us with a pool that is
18 left remaining with only a partial subset of what we've
19 agreed on today, or what we've discussed today. I think
20 there were many candidates, actually, that possessed
21 multiple characteristics and abilities, so that they make
22 our job a little bit easier, but in a way a little bit more
23 difficult. But, I think it's critical that we ensure any
24 possible elimination, even within the sub pools - at the
25 sub pool level - that we will be assured that, based on what

1 we've seen so far, that we will have a good Commission left,
2 for the decisions. So, at least one is ideal, but I think
3 if we can get more, that would be great.

4 VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: Yeah. No, I agree. And with
5 these skills that I think we're talking about now, are not
6 the skills that I think should be in every applicant, these
7 are these additional skills, like we learned in our training
8 to have somebody that is high functioning in math,
9 statistical, or -

10 PANEL MEMBER SPANO: Like analytical.

11 VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: Yes, be analytical, be high
12 functioning - I think it was computers that they also talked
13 about. This is these individuals and the facilitator,
14 definitely, and then somebody that can lead a team.
15 Everyone doesn't have to be able to lead a team, you know,
16 be the lead person, but I agree that we should have those
17 individuals in there.

18 CHAIR AHMADI: And I personally think that we - I
19 personally don't have any problem seeing that we have all
20 those qualities in all these applicants in terms of, you
21 know, the technical abilities, you know, you mentioned, for
22 example, computer skills, that's just an example that I'm
23 using, but I think there - if I can put it this way - on one
24 side, you have to consider all of these technical abilities,
25 analytical skills, as it's required by the law, and as we

1 think, you know, it's something that they should have. But,
2 on the other side, which is kind of like the additional
3 values as you were describing, the soft values, the
4 teamwork, commitment, personalities, egos, availability, and
5 flexibility, like you said, Mary, so -

6 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: I would interject to propose
7 that those are not soft skills, that those are, in fact,
8 additional examples of relevant analytical skills, which
9 include effectively working together as a team. Nasir is
10 correct that all of your applicants must have, and I think
11 at this point do have, the minimum qualifications in terms
12 of can you use a computer and that sort of thing, but I
13 think what I'm hearing Mary say is it would be great if you
14 could get at least one person who was fantastic at
15 statistics, because that is an additional level of strength
16 maybe beyond what the regulations require, I think that is
17 what I'm hearing. I mean, I am pleased to hear all of you
18 talking about things that I think are articulated in the
19 Regulations, those of course are your - you are confined by
20 those. But when you say things like being a team builder,
21 or needing to reach consensus, that's all part of working
22 well as a group. And when I hear you talking about good
23 communication skills and approachability, that's all part of
24 being able to effectively gather information, and so I want
25 to take you back to remind you that your Regulations govern

1 your work, and what you are talking about are additional
2 examples of specific characteristics of individuals that
3 actually are relevant analytical skills, as articulated in
4 the Regulations.

5 CHAIR AHMADI: Thank you, Stephanie, for the
6 clarification. So, I agree totally, you know. At this
7 point, as I mentioned, you know, all our applicants are at a
8 level that, based on our reviews and, you know, we went
9 through this rigorous process of reviewing their
10 application, and they all meet the minimum qualifications.
11 So that's what makes it more challenging, to look at
12 something beyond that to help us make the final decision.

13 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Is there additional
14 discussion on this item?

15 CHAIR AHMADI: I don't have anything in addition.

16 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Ms. Camacho?

17 VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: No.

18 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: I would ask for public
19 comment, but seeing there isn't any, we are now in our
20 period of General Public Comment, but seeing that there
21 isn't any, is there further business to come before the
22 Panel? Seeing that there is no further business, this
23 meeting is adjourned.

24 [Adjourned at 10:19 A.M.]